

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

MAR 15 2004

VALERIE G. DUGAN  
BRIAN M. DUGAN, PH.D.**DUGAN & DUGAN, PC**  
PATENTS, TRADEMARKS & COPYRIGHTS  
18 JOHN STREET  
TARRYTOWN, NY 10591(914)332-9081 TELEPHONE  
(914)332-9082 FACSIMILE  
DUGANEMAIL@DUGANPATENT.COM**FACSIMILE COVER SHEET****OFFICIAL**

March 15, 2004

**PLEASE DELIVER THE ATTACHED MESSAGE TO:**

Examiner: Naschica S. Morrison      Phone No.: (703) 305-0228  
Fax No.: (703) 872-9306  
From: Brian M. Dugan

---

Our File No.: Docket No. 4448/P2/CPS/IBSS/LAP

---

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Ronald Vern Schauer and John Charles  
Davies  
Serial No. : 10/099,900 ✓  
Filed : March 14, 2002  
For : FACILITIES CONNECTION BUCKET FOR PRE-  
FACILITATION OF WAFER FABRICATION  
EQUIPMENT  
Examiner : Naschica S. Morrison  
Group Art Unit : 3632

---

TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES INCLUDING THIS PAGE: 2

\*\*\*  
THIS FACSIMILE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE  
ADDRESSEE. THE CONTENT OF THIS FACSIMILE IS PRIVILEGED  
AND CONFIDENTIAL. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS FACSIMILE  
IN ERROR, OR IF YOU HAVE NOT RECEIVED LEGIBLE COPIES OF  
ALL PAGES, PLEASE NOTIFY US BY TELEPHONE IMMEDIATELY.  
\*\*\*

lines 44-48). The Nagai patent describes a home biodata interfacing device. (Nagai, Abstract).

Independent claims 1 and 19-21 each require "a mechanism for mounting the box to a support pedestal of a semiconductor fabrication facility." None of the Flynn, Ramberg, McCarthy, Byrne and Nagai patents appears to disclose such a limitation. Claim 23 requires "indicating a location within a fabrication facility for installing a facilities box" and "providing a standardized facilities box having a mechanism for selectively coupling any one of a set of add-on features to the standardized facilities box." The Byrne patent does not appear to disclose such limitations. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 19-21 and 23, and claims 2-3, 5-7, 10, 12-13 and 22 which depend therefrom, are not anticipated by the above references.

The rejection of claims 2-4, 7, 10 and 12 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. section 103 as being unpatentable over Flynn in view of Ramberg, the rejection of claims 14 and 17 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. section 103 as being unpatentable over Ramberg in view of JP 08-323036 (Niwa), the rejection of claims 15 and 18 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. section 103 as being unpatentable over McCarthy in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,085,987 (Vartdal) and the Applicants' traversal thereof

The Office Action rejects claims 2-4, 7, 10 and 12 under section 103 as being unpatentable over Flynn in view of Ramberg. As described above, the Flynn and Ramberg patents describe a "container and method of transport for transporting lobster and like live cargo" and "[a] container for storing live bait," respectively. (Flynn, Abstract); (Ramberg, Abstract). The Applicants respectfully submit that the Flynn and Ramberg patents are non-analogous prior art at least since containers for storing or transporting live cargo would seem entirely unrelated to (and/or unusable within and/or inconsistent with the cleanliness requirements of) the field of the Applicants'